

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/699,095	10/31/2003	Donald W. Verser	210441US (CPCM:0016/FLE)		
75	90 07/26/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
Michael G. Flo	etcher	LU, C CAIXIA			
Flectcher Yoder	r ·		·		
P. O. Box 6922	89		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Houston, TX 77269-2289			1713		
			DATE MAH ED: 07/26/2006	-	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

S. Patent and Tr FOL-326 (Re		Office Action Sumr	nary	Part of Paper No./Mail D	Date 20050720
2) Notice 3) Inform Paper	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review of Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 of No(s)/Mail Date 10/31/03.			nary (PTO-413) ail Date nal Patent Application (PT	O-152)
12)□ / a)[Acknowledgment is made of a clair All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priorit 2. Certified copies of the priorit 3. Copies of the certified copies application from the Internat ee the attached detailed Office acti	y documents have by y documents have by s of the priority docu ional Bureau (PCT R	een received. een received in Appl ments have been rec ule 17.2(a)).	ication No eived in this Nationa	l Stage
	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119	J wio Examinor			
	The drawing(s) filed on 31 October Applicant may not request that any obj Replacement drawing sheet(s) including The oath or declaration is objected	ection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. uired if the drawing(s) i	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s objected to. See 37 C	CFR 1.121(d).
	The specification is objected to by t	he Examiner.			
1)	Responsive to communication(s) fi This action is FINAL. Since this application is in conditio closed in accordance with the prac on of Claims Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) 21-27 is/a Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restront	2b)⊠ This action is n for allowance exceptice under <i>Ex parte</i> of application. The are withdrawn from the content of the con	non-final. pt for formal matters Quayle, 1935 C.D. 1	•	e merits is
THE I - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failur Any r	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUL sions of time may be available under the provision SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this corperiod for reply specified above is less than thirty period for reply is specified above, the maximum et or reply within the set or extended period for reply received by the Office later than three monther displayments. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NICATION. ns of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no nmunication. (30) days, a reply within the s statutory period will apply and bly will, by statute, cause the a	event, however, may a reply tatutory minimum of thirty (30 I will expire SIX (6) MONTHS application to become ABAND	be timely filed) days will be considered time from the mailing date of this DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commu r Reply	inication appears on t	the cover sheet with t	he correspondence a	ddress
	·	Caixia I		1713	
•	Office Action Summary	10/699 Exami r	·	VERSER ET AL.	T

Application/Control Number: 10/699,095 Page 2

Art Unit: 1713

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election of Group I, claims 1-20 in the reply filed on April 25, 2005 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kendrick et al. (US 6,204,344).

The instant claims are directed to a process for producing solid polymer particles by conducting slurry polymerization in a loop reactor, passing the intermediate polymer slurry product through a heated conduit to producing a concentrated intermediate product and a vapor, and separating the vapor from the concentrated intermediate product by centrifugal force in a cyclone.

Application/Control Number: 10/699,095 Page 3

Art Unit: 1713

Kendrick teaches conducting a slurry polymerization process in a loop reactor to produce a polymer slurry intermediate product and recovering the polymer solid by passing the polymer slurry intermediate product to a heating conduit, a first flash tank and a first cyclone to separate the intermediate product to polymer particles (which are transferred to a conventional dryer) and vapor (which contains some polymer fine and catalyst), then passing the vapor to a second conduit, a second flash tank and a second cyclone to further separate the solids from the vapor, and finally passing the vapor the through a filter for recycling (col. 8, line 33 to col. 11, line 58, and Examples 1-4).

The prior art examples do not disclose all the claimed limitations such as separation of the polymer solids from the vapor in the cyclone by centrifugal force, the percentage of the vapor to separated from the polymer slurry intermediate product, the length of the receiving zone and the residence time for drying the polymer solids. However, it is understood in the art that the cyclone is designed to use centrifugal force to separate the solid material form the non-solids, and the polymerization process disclosed in the prior art is very similar to those disclosed in the instant specification. Under these circumstances, one of the ordinary skill in the art would have expected that the claimed limitations would be inherent in the prior art polymers.

Even if the claimed properties are not inherent in the polymers of the prior art examples, it would still have been obvious to a skilled artisan to arrive at the claimed subject matter because it appears that the claimed subject matter is within the generic disclosure of the prior art and expected to work.

Application/Control Number: 10/699,095

Art Unit: 1713

Once a product appearing to be substantially identical is found and a 35 USC 102/103 rejection made, the burden of proof is shifted to the applicant to show an unobvious difference. In re Fitzgerald, 205 USPQ 594. In re Fessmann, 180 USPQ 324. Applicants have not met their burden to demonstrate an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the products of the prior art examples.

5. Claims 2-6, 8-13, 16-17 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kendrick et al. (US 6,204,344).

Kendrick's teaching is relied upon as shown above. As indicated above, Kendrick does not expressly indicate the percentage of the vapor to separated from the polymer slurry intermediate product, the length of the receiving zone and the residence time for drying the polymer solids. However, any such differences are deemed to be result effective variables that one of ordinary skill in the art would be expected to manipulate to advantage based on a consideration of both economic and performance factors. Additionally, such limitations can be considered to have been simply known as conventional to the artisan practicing in the art at the time the invention was made and /or were common practices which were so well known in the art that they would have been taken for granted. MPEP 716.02(a) and 2144. If applicants believe that one or more limitations are critical to the invention, then applicants should limit the claims to reflect such critical limitations as well as indicate where in the specification such critical limitations are discussed and demonstrated.

The limitations of all claims have been considered and are deemed to be within the purview of the prior art.

Application/Control Number: 10/699,095

Art Unit: 1713

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Caixia Lu whose telephone number is (571) 272-1106. The examiner can normally be reached from 9:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful and the matter is urgent, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu, can be reached at (571) 272-1114. The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1700.

Caixia Lu, Ph. D. Primary Examiner July 22, 2005 Page 5